

### **REMARKS**

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given to the present application and the courtesies extended to applicant's representative during a telephone interview on December 14, 2005. During that interview, the Examiner indicated that Claim 22 was allowable. Therefore, Applicant has amended applicable dependent claims to depend from Claim 22 as well as made minor amendments to Claim 22 to provide proper antecedent basis for these dependent claims. In addition, remaining independent claims have been cancelled from the present application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-17 and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by an article entitled "Hierarchical Multiresolution Video Shot Transition Detection Scheme". This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.132, Applicant submits a declaration which attributes the claimed subject matter of the present application to the named inventor. Applicant has shown that the reference is not by another and thus does not constitute prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(a). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied in the Office Action. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is believed that the previously pending claims are patentably distinct over this combination of references. For instance, none of the relied upon reference teach or suggest identifying cut transitions in a video sequence based on a low frequency signature in combination with identifying fade transitions in a video sequence based on a high frequency signature. However, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, independent Claim 1 has been cancelled from the present application. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 19, 2005

By: 

\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy D. MacIntyre  
Reg. No. 42824

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600  
TDM/drl